

6B

Information

Professional Services Committee

Update on the Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment Requirement for Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Teacher Preparation Programs

Executive Summary: This agenda item provides an update on the implementation plan for the teaching performance assessment requirement for multiple and single subject professional teacher preparation programs.

Recommended Action: For information only.

Presenter: Phyllis Jacobson, Administrator,
Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal: 1

Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators.

- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the preparation of professional educators.
- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the performance of credential candidates.

**Update on the Implementation of the Teaching Performance
Assessment Requirement for Preliminary Multiple and Single
Subject Teacher Preparation Programs**

Introduction

At its meeting of November-December 2006, the Commission took action to reinstate the Assessment Quality Standards for multiple and single subject professional teacher preparation programs and to approve the initial implementation plan for the teaching performance assessment requirement pursuant to SB 1209 (Chapter 517, Statutes of 2006). This agenda item provides further information concerning the overall implementation plan for the teaching performance assessment requirement.

Background

Senate Bill 2042 (Chapter 548, Statutes of 1998) required all candidates for a preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credential to pass an assessment of teaching performance in order to earn a teaching credential. This assessment of teaching performance is designed to measure the candidate's knowledge, skills and ability with relation to California's adopted *Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP)*, as these are exemplified in the *Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs)*. Implementation of the TPA requirement of SB 2042 was delayed by the Commission in 2003 in response to requests received from the Legislature and others during the state's fiscal crisis at that time. SB 1209 (Chapter 517, Statutes of 2006), however, mandated the implementation of the teaching performance assessment requirement for all multiple and single subject professional teacher preparation programs as of July 1, 2008.

Updated Plan to Provide Technical Assistance to Program Sponsors

In order to assist all program sponsors in understanding new requirements relating both to the teaching performance assessment and the Commission's revised accreditation system, staff have planned a series of one-day technical assistance meetings around the state for January-February 2007. The following chart indicates the date and location of each of these meetings.

Chart 1 – Technical Assistance Meetings (TPA and Accreditation)

Date	Location
January 31, 2007	Southern California – CSU Dominguez Hills
February 1, 2007	Southern California – National Univ. (San Diego)
February 2, 2007	Southern California – UC Riverside

REVISED

February 16, 2007	Sacramento – Commission Office
February 22, 2007	Northern CA – National University, San Jose
February 23, 2007	Central CA – Fresno COE

The first three of these technical assistance meetings will have already taken place at the time of the February Commission meeting, with the remainder scheduled for later this month.

Updated Training Plan for the CA TPA Model, February through May 2007

To provide training on the tasks of the CA TPA model for those program sponsors choosing to implement this performance assessment model, staff has initially scheduled the following training sessions, beginning on the last day of February 2007 and continuing through May 2007. In order to better assist the field as well as the candidates in understanding the nature of the tasks of the CA TPA model, the titles by which these tasks will be known are also being revised to be more descriptive and informative. The former “Task Two” will be known as the “Designing Instruction” task; the former “Task Three” will be known as the “Assessing Instruction” task; and the former “Task Four” will be known as the “Culminating Teaching Experience” task. The chart below uses the revised task names.

Chart 2- Overview of CA TPA Model Initial Training Sessions

Date	Location	CA TPA Task to be Trained
February 28, 2007	Ontario/Montclair USD	Foundations/Orientation Day
March 1-2, 2007	Ontario/Montclair USD	Designing Instruction
March 14, 2007	Loyola Marymount and U. of Phoenix (North & South CA)	Foundations/Orientation Day
March 15-16, 2007	Loyola Marymount and U. of Phoenix (North & South CA)	Designing Instruction
April 18, 2007	Ontario/Montclair USD	Foundations/Orientation Day
April 19-20, 2007	Ontario/Montclair USD	Assessing Learning
April 25, 2007	Loyola Marymount and U. of Phoenix (North & South CA)	Foundations/Orientation Day
April 26-27, 2007	Loyola Marymount and U. of Phoenix (North & South CA)	Assessing Learning
May 14-15, 2007	Ontario/Montclair USD and Northern CA (TBD)	Culminating Teaching Experience
May 18-19, 2007	Loyola Marymount and U. of Phoenix (North & South CA)	Culminating Teaching Experience.
May 22-23, 2007	Southern CA (TBD)	Culminating Teaching Exper.

REVISED

Chart 3 – CA TPA Model Training by Topic

Topic	Date	Location
Foundations/Orientation Day	February 28, 2007	Southern CA
Foundations/Orientation Day	March 14, 2007	Northern CA and Southern CA
Foundations/Orientation Day	April 18, 2007	Southern CA
Foundations/Orientation Day	April 24, 2007	Northern CA and Southern CA
Designing Instruction	March 1-2, 2007	Southern CA
Designing Instruction	March 15-16, 2007	Northern CA and Southern CA
Assessing Learning	April 19-20, 2007	Southern CA
Assessing Learning	April 26-27, 2007	Northern CA and Southern CA
Culminating Teaching Exper.	May 14-15, 2007	Northern CA and Southern CA
Culminating Teaching Exper.	May 18-19, 2007	Northern CA and Southern CA
Culminating Teaching Exper.	May 22-23, 2007	Southern CA

Staff recognizes that based on the results of the decisions made by program sponsors regarding which TPA model they choose to implement within their teacher preparation programs, additional CA TPA model training sessions will need to be scheduled beginning in summer 2007. The Commission will be provided an update on any additional CA TPA model training sessions that are subsequently scheduled beyond May 2007 based on program sponsor needs.

Staff also notes that all of these training sessions are labor-intensive, requiring sufficient trainers to staff multiple sessions simultaneously around the state, and also requiring program sponsors to identify and send appropriate staff and/or faculty to these training sessions. In order for an individual who has not previously participated in any CA TPA training to qualify as an assessor, it takes a one-time only, one-day “Foundations Day/Orientation to the CA TPA Model” training, plus two training days per CA TPA task on which the assessor wants to qualify. Assessors may qualify on only one task or on multiple tasks, depending on the needs and implementation design of the program sponsor.

The “Foundations Day/Orientation to the CA TPA Model” training provides an intensive day of training. Each of the scheduled Foundations Day/Orientation to the CA TPA Model training days is then followed by a two-day task-focused training scheduled from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. each of the two days. Assessors may choose to attend the Foundations Day/Orientation to the CA TPA Model training and remain for the following two-day task-focused training, or assessors may choose to attend the Foundations Day/Orientation to the CA TPA Model training and then wait to attend the next scheduled two-day task-focused training at a later date.

Description of the Three CA TPA Model Tasks Included in the Training Plan from February through May 2007

- The ***Designing Instruction*** task requires the candidate to make appropriate connections between what the teacher knows about the students in the class to his/her instructional planning for those students. This written task contains a five-step set of prompts that focuses the candidate on first identifying and then

REVISED

applying the connections between the students' characteristics and learning needs and the teacher's instructional planning and adaptations for those specific students.

The following TPEs are measured in the *Designing Instruction* task:

- Making subject matter comprehensible to students (TPE 1)
 - Engaging and supporting students in learning (TPE 4, 6, 7)
 - Planning instruction and designing learning experiences for students (TPE 8, 9)
 - Developing as a professional educator (TPE 13)
- The ***Assessing Learning*** task requires candidates to demonstrate their ability to design standards-based, appropriate student assessment activities in the context of a small group of students using a specific standards-based lesson of the candidate's choice. In addition, candidates demonstrate their ability to conduct assessment activities appropriately to assess student learning and to diagnose student instructional needs based on the results of the assessment(s).

The following TPEs are measured in the *Assessing Learning* task:

- Assessing student learning (TPE 3)
 - Engaging and supporting students in learning (TPE 6, 7)
 - Planning instruction and designing learning experiences for students (TPE 8, 9)
 - Developing as a professional educator (TPE 13)
- The ***Culminating Teaching Experience*** task is the culminating activity of the set of three TPA tasks. In this task, the candidate designs a standards-based lesson for a class of students and teaches that lesson to actual K-12 students within the classroom setting, while making appropriate use of class time and instructional resources, meeting the differing needs of individual students within the class, managing instruction and interactions with and between students, and assessing student learning. Following the lesson, the candidate demonstrates the ability to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the lesson. To ensure equity to all candidates in the scoring of the *Culminating Teaching* task, a videotape of the lesson is collected and reviewed as evidence during the scoring process.

All TPEs except for TPE 12 (Professional, Legal and Ethical Obligations) are measured in the *Culminating Teaching Experience* task:

- Making subject matter comprehensible to students (TPE 1)
- Assessing student learning (TPE 2, 3)
- Engaging and supporting students in learning (TPE 4, 5, 6, 7)
- Planning instruction and designing learning experiences for students (TPE 8, 9)
- Creating and maintaining effective environments for student learning (TPE 10, 11)
- Developing as a professional educator (TPE 13)

REVISED

RICA/TPA Study

In accordance with the requirements of SB 1209 (Chapter 517, Statutes of 2006), the Commission scheduled a public study session earlier in this meeting of February 2007 regarding the implications of incorporating the assessment of ability, skills and knowledge related to effective reading instruction that is assessed by the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) within the teacher performance assessment. It is important to note that any decisions ultimately made regarding the potential inclusion of the RICA assessment content into the teaching performance assessment would apply to all teaching performance assessment models approved by the Commission.

Implementation of the Reinstated Former Assessment Quality Standards 19-21

At the Commission meeting of November-December 2006, the Commission reinstated as Professional Teacher Preparation Program Standards three former Assessment Quality Standards, and also renumbered these standards.

All Commission-approved multiple and single subject teacher preparation programs will need to respond to these three standards, describing how each program plans to implement the chosen teaching performance assessment model. The submission and review process is scheduled to be completed by January, 2008.

The three standards are:

Teacher Preparation Program Standard 19: Assessment Administered for Validity, Accuracy and Fairness

The sponsor of the professional teacher preparation program implements the Teaching Performance Assessment according to the assessment design. In the program, candidate responses to pedagogical assessment tasks are scored in a manner that ensures strong consistency of scoring among assessors, particularly in relation to the established passing standard. The program sponsor periodically monitors the administration, scoring and results of the assessment to ensure equitable treatment of candidates. Prior to initial assessment, each candidate receives the *Teaching Performance Expectations* and clear, accurate information about the nature of the assessment and the pedagogical tasks.

Teacher Preparation Program Standard 20: Assessor Qualifications and Training

To foster fairness and consistency in assessing candidate competence in the professional teacher preparation program, qualified assessors accurately assess each candidate's responses to the pedagogical assessment tasks in relation to the *Teaching Performance Expectations* and the multilevel scoring scales. The program sponsor establishes assessor selection criteria that ensure substantial pedagogical expertise on the part of each assessor. The sponsor selects and relies on assessors who meet the established criteria. Each prospective assessor completes a rigorous, comprehensive assessor training program. The program sponsor determines each assessor's continuing service as an assessor in the program primarily based on the assessor's scoring accuracy and documentation. Each continuing assessor is recalibrated annually.

REVISED

Teacher Preparation Program Standard 21: Assessment Administration, Resources and Reporting

In the professional teacher preparation program, the Teaching Performance Assessment is administered and reported in ways that are consistent with its stated purpose and design. To ensure accuracy in administration of the assessment, the program sponsor annually commits sufficient resources, expertise and effort to its planning, coordination and implementation. Following assessment, candidates receive performance information that is clear and detailed enough to (a) serve as a useful basis for their Individual Induction Plans developed within an approved Induction Programs, or (b) guide them in study and practice as they prepare for reassessment, as needed. While protecting candidate privacy, the sponsor uses individual results of the assessment as one basis for recommending candidates for Preliminary Teaching Credentials. The sponsor uses aggregated assessment results in appropriate ways to improve the program. The sponsor documents the administration, scoring and reporting of the assessment in accordance with state accreditation procedures.

Updated Plan for Reviewing and Approving Alternate Model Teaching Performance Assessments

The Commission approved the implementation schedule below at the November-December 2006 meeting. The initial date for program sponsors to notify the CTC if they will be submitting an alternative TPA for review and approval has been moved up to February 2007.

Chart 4- Implementation Schedule

Date	Event	Responsible
Dec. 1, 2006	Reinstatement of the Assessment Quality Standards as new Professional Teacher Preparation Program Standards 19-21, and adoption of Guidelines for sponsors of alternative teaching performance assessment models	Commission
Beginning February 2007 and ongoing	Program sponsors notify CTC if they will be submitting an alternative TPA for review and approval	Program sponsors, as applicable
Beginning March 1, 2007 and ongoing	Program sponsors submit alternative TPA models for Commission review and approval	Program sponsors, as applicable
Beginning April 2007 and ongoing	Expert panel reviews alternative TPA models and makes recommendations for approval to the Commission, as per EC 44320.2 (d)(3)	CTC staff and expert panel
July 1, 2008	All approved professional teacher preparation programs implement an approved TPA with all candidates	All Program sponsors

REVISED

Sponsors of alternative teaching performance assessment models will need to respond to the two Assessment Design Standards adopted by the Commission at the November-December 2006 Commission meeting. These two standards are provided in Attachment A. The full written response to these standards and to each element within the two standards, along with supporting evidence and/or documentation, will constitute the required application to the Commission for review and approval of the alternative teaching performance assessment model. An expert review team comprised of Commission staff and other assessment professionals will review the submission and make a recommendation to the Commission concerning the approval of each alternative teaching performance assessment model.

REVISED

Attachment A

California Teaching Performance Assessment Design Standards, as Adopted by the Commission in December 2006

Assessment Design Standard 1: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness (Assessment Design Standard 1 Applies to Programs that Request Approval of Alternative Assessments)

The sponsor of the professional teacher preparation program requests approval of a Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) in which complex pedagogical assessment tasks and multi-level scoring scales are linked to the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). The program sponsor clearly states the intended uses of the assessment, anticipates its potential misuses, and ensures that local uses are consistent with the statement of intent. The sponsor maximizes the fairness of assessment design for all groups of candidates in the program, and ensures that the established passing standard on the TPA is equivalent to or more rigorous than the recommended state passing standard.

Required Elements for Assessment Design Standard 1: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness

1(a) The Teaching Performance Assessment includes complex pedagogical assessment tasks to prompt aspects of candidate performance that measure the TPEs. Each task is substantively related to two or more major domains of the TPEs. For use in judging candidate-generated responses to each pedagogical task, the assessment also includes multi-level scoring scales that are clearly related to the same TPEs that the task measures. Each task and its associated scales measure two or more TPEs. Collectively, the tasks and scales in the assessment address key aspects of the six major domains of the TPEs. The sponsor of the professional teacher preparation program documents the relationships between TPEs, tasks and scales.

1(b) To preserve the validity and fairness of the assessment over time, the sponsor may need to develop and field-test new pedagogical assessment tasks and multi-level scoring scales to replace or strengthen prior ones. Initially and periodically, the sponsor analyzes the assessment tasks and scoring scales to ensure that they yield important evidence that represents candidate knowledge and skill related to the TPEs, and serves as a basis for determining entry-level pedagogical competence to teach the curriculum and student population of California's K-12 public schools. The sponsor records the basis and results of each analysis, and modifies the tasks and scales as needed.

1(c) Consistent with the language of the TPEs, the sponsor defines scoring scales so different candidates for credentials can earn acceptable scores on the Teaching Performance Assessment with the use of different pedagogical practices that support implementation of the K-12 content standards and curriculum frameworks. The sponsor takes steps to plan and anticipate the appropriate scoring of candidates who use pedagogical practices that are educationally effective but not explicitly anticipated in the scoring scales.

REVISED

1(d) The sponsor develops scoring scales and assessor training procedures that focus primarily on teaching performance and that minimize the effects of candidate factors that are not clearly related to pedagogical competence, which may include (depending on the circumstances) factors such as personal attire, appearance, demeanor, speech patterns and accents that are not likely to affect student learning.

1(e) The sponsor publishes a clear statement of the intended uses of the assessment. The statement demonstrates the sponsor's clear understanding of the high-stakes implications of the assessment for candidates, the public schools, and K-12 students. The statement includes appropriate cautions about additional or alternative uses for which the assessment is not valid. Before releasing information about the assessment design to another organization, the sponsor informs the organization that the assessment is valid only for determining the pedagogical competence of candidates for initial teaching credentials in California. All elements of assessment design and development are consistent with the intended use of the assessment for determining the pedagogical competence of candidates for Preliminary Teaching Credentials in California.

1(f) The sponsor completes content review and editing procedures to ensure that pedagogical assessment tasks and directions to candidates are culturally and linguistically sensitive, fair and appropriate for candidates from diverse backgrounds. The sponsor ensures that groups of candidates interpret the pedagogical tasks and the assessment directions as intended by the designers, and that assessment results are consistently reliable for each major group of candidates.

1(g) The sponsor completes basic psychometric analyses to identify pedagogical assessment tasks and/or scoring scales that show differential effects in relation to candidates' race, ethnicity, language, gender or disability. When group pass-rate differences are found, the sponsor investigates to determine whether the differences are attributable to (a) inadequate representation of the TPEs in the pedagogical tasks and/or scoring scales, or (b) overrepresentation of irrelevant skills, knowledge or abilities in the tasks/scales. The sponsor acts promptly to maximize the fairness of the assessment for all groups of candidates and documents the analysis process, findings, and action taken.

1(h) In designing assessment administration procedures, the sponsor includes administrative accommodations that preserve assessment validity while addressing issues of access for candidates with disabilities.

1(i) In the course of developing or adopting a passing standard that is demonstrably equivalent to or more rigorous than the State recommended standard, the sponsor secures and reflects on the considered judgments of teachers, the supervisors of teachers, the support providers of new teachers, and other preparers of teachers regarding necessary and acceptable levels of proficiency on the part of entry-level teachers. The sponsor periodically reconsiders the reasonableness of the scoring scales and established passing standard.

REVISED

Assessment Design Standard 2: Assessment Designed for Reliability and Fairness

(Assessment Design Standard 2 Applies to Programs that Request Approval of Alternative Assessments)

The sponsor of the professional teacher preparation program requests approval of an assessment that will yield, in relation to the key aspects of the major domains of the TPEs, enough collective evidence of each candidate's pedagogical performance to serve as an adequate basis to judge the candidate's general pedagogical competence for a Preliminary Teaching Credential. The sponsor carefully monitors assessment development to ensure consistency with the stated purpose of the assessment. The Teaching Performance Assessment includes a comprehensive program to train and re-train assessors. The sponsor periodically evaluates assessment design to ensure equitable treatment of candidates. The assessment design and its implementation contribute to local and statewide consistency in the assessment of teaching competence.

Required Elements for Assessment Design Standard 2: Assessment Designed for Reliability and Fairness

2(a) In relation to the key aspects of the major domains of the TPEs, the pedagogical assessment tasks and the associated directions to candidates are designed to yield enough evidence for an overall judgment of each candidate's pedagogical qualifications for a Preliminary Teaching Credential. The program sponsor will document sufficiency of candidate performance evidence through thorough field-testing of pedagogical tasks, scoring scales, and directions to candidates.

2(b) Pedagogical assessment tasks and scoring scales are extensively field-tested in practice before being used operationally in the Teaching Performance Assessment. The sponsor of the program evaluates the field-test results thoroughly and documents the field-test design, participation, methods, results and interpretation.

2 (c) The Teaching Performance Assessment system includes a comprehensive program to train assessors who will score candidate responses to the pedagogical assessment tasks. An assessor training pilot program demonstrates convincingly that prospective and continuing assessors gain a deep understanding of the TPEs, the pedagogical assessment tasks and the multi-level scoring scales. The training program includes task-based scoring trials in which an assessment trainer evaluates and certifies each assessor's scoring accuracy in relation to the scoring scales associated with the task. When new pedagogical tasks and scoring scales are incorporated into the assessment, the sponsor provides additional training to the assessors, as needed.

2(d) In conjunction with the provisions of Teacher Preparation Program Standard 19, the sponsor plans and implements periodic evaluations of the assessor training program, which include systematic feedback from assessors and assessment trainers, and which lead to substantive improvements in the training as needed.

2(e) The program sponsor requests approval of a detailed plan for the scoring of selected assessment tasks by two trained assessors for the purpose of evaluating the reliability of scorers during field-testing and operational administration of the assessment. The subsequent assignment of one or two assessors to each assessment task is based on a cautious interpretation of the ongoing evaluation findings.

REVISED

2(f) The sponsor carefully plans successive administrations of the assessment to ensure consistency in elements that contribute to the reliability of scores and the accurate determination of each candidate's passing status, including consistency in the difficulty of pedagogical assessment tasks, levels of teaching proficiency that are reflected in the multilevel scoring scales, and the overall level of performance required by the Commission's recommended passing standard on the assessment.

2(g) The sponsor ensures equivalent scoring across successive administrations of the assessment and between the Commission's model and local assessments by: using marker performances to facilitate the training of first-time assessors and the further training of continuing assessors; monitoring and recalibrating local scoring through third party reviews of scores that have been assigned to candidate responses; and periodically studying proficiency levels reflected in the adopted passing standard.

2(h) The sponsor investigates and documents the consistency of scores among and across assessors and across successive administrations of the assessment, with particular focus on the reliability of scores at and near the adopted passing standard. To ensure that the overall construct being assessed is cohesive, the sponsor demonstrates that scores on each pedagogical task are sufficiently correlated with overall scores on the remaining tasks in the assessment. The sponsor demonstrates that the assessment procedures, taken as a whole, maximize the accurate determination of each candidate's overall pass-fail status on the assessment.

2(i) The sponsor's assessment design includes an appeal procedure for candidates who do not pass the assessment, including an equitable process for rescoring of evidence already submitted by an appellant candidate in the program.